

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-40 prior to entering this amendment.

Claims 9-14 and 23-28 are allowed.

The Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14-17, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36-38. No new matter is added.

APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 9-14 and 23-28 are indicated as being allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the consideration and allowance of these claims.

Although the Applicant's attorney agrees with the Examiner's conclusion that these claims are allowable, the Applicant's attorney notes that the claims may be allowable for reasons other than those identified by the Examiner and does not concede that the Examiner's characterizations of the terms of the claims and the prior art are correct.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 15-22, and 29-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Barker *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,646,765) in view of Sasabe *et al.* (U.S. Patent 3,928,719).

The Application is traversed for the reasons stated in the Amendment filed on April 2, 2008; however, Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14-17, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36-38 to expedite prosecution. For example claim 1 recites an image apparatus, comprising:

- a scanner adapted to scan a first document;
- a memory adapted to store image data corresponding to said first document;
- a signal control device adapted to generate a notify signal in response to said image data being stored in said memory; and
- a switch control device adapted to receive a first signal to display said document on a display device, and further adapted to request a transmission of a next document to be scanned, so that said scanner has the capability to transmit said next document substantially concurrently with a displaying of said first document, wherein said next document is not displayed on said display device unless the switch control device receives a second signal to display said next document.

Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for similar reasons as allowed claims 9 and 23. As claims 2-8 and 38 depend from claim 1, they are believed to be patentable over the art for at last

the foregoing reasons as well as for the further novel features recited respectively therein. Claims 15-22 and 29-40 are believed to be allowable for similar reasons as claims 1-14 and 23-28. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 15-22, and 29-40 is respectfully requested.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases, Applicant may have amended or argued the allowability of independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-40. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/Bryan D. Kirkpatrick/
Bryan D. Kirkpatrick
Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170